



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/655,422

09/04/2003

Sandeep Chennakeshu

9314-16

6705

54414

7590

04/16/2008

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.

P.O. BOX 37428

RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

MONTOYA, OSCHTA I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/655,422	Applicant(s) CHENNAKESHU, SANDEEP	
	Examiner OSCHTA MONTOYA	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16,17,19-29,37,38 and 40-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16,17,19-29,37,38 and 40-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-17, 19-29, 37-38, and 40-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument (page 12 paragraph 5 and page 14 paragraph 5) that the Bluetooth protocol teaches automatically forming a network as opposed to automatically initiating transmitting generated information for display, the examiner respectfully disagrees since it is well known in the art the use of Bluetooth protocol between devices within range to establish a connection and to transfer data, in this case the data will be the video signal (see Erasala/Yen reference submitted by applicant, section 2.2, 2nd paragraph).

In response to applicant's argument (page 16 paragraph 3rd) that nothing in Magnuson teaches a beacon that allows a determination if a device is within range, applicant should note that the use of beacons is to determine if a device is within range, also Magnuson teaches that if not code (beacon) is received it is because the device is out of range (Col. 4, lines 55-65).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

Art Unit: 2623

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Liu teaches two electronic devices trying to connect in order to transfer data and Magnuson teaches the use of beacons to check if the electronic devices are within range; therefore, the motivation will be to make sure the devices are within range in order to establish the connection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu, US 2003/0169287 in view of Florence, US 2002/0188948 in view of Motoyama, US 4,837,623.

Regarding claim 1, Liu discloses a method of displaying information from a handheld electronic device on a video screen remote from the handheld electronic device, the method comprising: receiving information from the handheld electronic device over a wireless coupling (Para. 10, lines 17-19, fig. 1); responsive to receiving the information from the handheld electronic device, generating a video signal

corresponding to the information from the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 23-26); and providing the generated video signal to the video screen for display of the information on the video screen (Para. 10, lines 21-23, fig.1).

Liu fails to teach that wherein receiving information from the handheld electronic device is preceded by determining if information is being received from the handheld electronic device;

wherein the operations of receiving the information from the handheld electronic device, generating the video signal, and providing the video signal to the video screen are performed automatically responsive to determining that information is being transmitted from the handheld electronic device; and

wherein the method further comprises automatically providing an alternate video to the video screen responsive to determining that information is not being transmitted from the handheld electronic device.

In an analogous art, Florence teaches the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol to transfer data between a handheld device and a receiver (1305-figure 13, Para 66). It is well known in the art that before any data transfer using Bluetooth wireless protocol a determination has to be made as to who is trying to send the data in order to accept the data (see applicant's admitted prior art "Bluetooth technology" document by Erasala and Yen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu's method to include the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol, as taught by Florence. The motivation would have been to provide a suitable wireless communication link.

Liu and Florence do not teach the method further comprises automatically providing an alternate video to the video screen responsive to determining that information is not being transmitted from the handheld electronic device.

In an analogous art, Motoyama teaches automatically providing an alternate video (Col. 3, lines 55-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu and Florence method to include showing an alternate video, as taught by Motoyama. The motivation would have been to give the user a video even if there is no connection between the devices.

Claim 3 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the information from the handheld electronic device comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of an e-mail received by the handheld electronic device, a game screen for a game being played on the handheld electronic device, an internet page received by the handheld electronic device, a photograph, and a video clip (see Liu Para. 10, lines 45-53).

Regarding claim 5, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the handheld electronic device comprises a radiotelephone (see Liu Para. 10, lines 42-43, and fig. 2C).

Regarding claim 6, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the handheld electronic device comprises a personal digital assistant (see Liu Para. 10, lines 39-40, and fig. 2B).

Regarding claim 8, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the video screen comprises a television (see Liu Para. 12, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 9, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the handheld electronic device includes a local display mounted in a housing of the handheld electronic device and wherein the local display is small relative to the remote video screen (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26, fig. 2B).

Regarding claim 10, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 9 showing the information on the local display of the handheld electronic device concurrently with showing the information on the remote video screen (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 37, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the information is configured for display on a local display of the handheld electronic device (see Liu Para. 10, lines 7-8).

Regarding claim 40, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama disclose the method according to Claim 9 further comprising showing the information on the local display of the handheld electronic device concurrently with showing the information on the remote video screen (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu, Florence, and Motoyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Allport, US 6,097,441.

Regarding claim 4, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama disclose the method according to claim 1.

Liu, Florence, and Motoyama fail to teach that wherein the video signal further comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a horizontal line sync pulse, a color reference burst, a reference black level, picture luminance information, color saturation information, color hue information, and a vertical sync pulse.

In an analogous art, Allport teaches a video signal having attribute adjustment features (Col. 4, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu, Florence, and Motoyama's method to include attribute adjustment, as taught by Allport. The motivation would have been to give the user a better video quality.

5. Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Motoyama.

Regarding claim 11, Liu discloses a video signal generator comprising: a receiver configured to receive information from a handheld electronic device over a wireless coupling (Para. 10, lines 17-19, fig. 1); a processor configured to automatically generate a video signal corresponding to the information from the handheld electronic device responsive to receiving the information from the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 23-26); and a video output configured to automatically provide the video signal to a video screen for display on the video screen responsive to receiving the information from the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 21-23, fig. 1).

Liu fails to teach the video output is further configured to provide an alternate video signal to the video screen if information is not being received from the handheld electronic device.

In an analogous art, Motoyama teaches automatically providing an alternate video (Col. 3, lines 55-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu's method to include showing an alternate video, as taught by Motoyama. The motivation would have been to give the user a video even if there is no connection between the devices.

Regarding claim 14, Liu and Motoyama teach the video signal generator according to claim 11 wherein the handheld electronic device comprises at least one of a radiotelephone and a personal digital assistant (see Liu Para. 10, lines 39-43, figs. 2B and 2C).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Motoyama as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Florence.

Regarding claim 12, Liu and Motoyama disclose the video signal generator of claim 11.

Liu and Motoyama fail to teach the receiver is configured to receive the information according to a Bluetooth wireless protocol.

In an analogous art, Florence teaches the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol to transfer data between a handheld device and a receiver (1305-figure 13, Para 66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu's method to include the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol, as taught by Florence. The motivation would have been to provide a suitable wireless communication link.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Motoyama as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Allport.

Regarding claim 13, Liu and Motoyama disclose the method according to claim 11.

Liu and Motoyama fail to teach that wherein the video signal further comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a horizontal line sync pulse, a color reference burst, a reference black level, picture luminance information, color saturation information, color hue information, and a vertical sync pulse.

In an analogous art, Allport teaches a video signal having attribute adjustment features (Col. 4, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu and Motoyama's method to include attribute adjustment, as taught by Allport. The motivation would have been to give the user a better video quality.

8. Claims 16-17 and 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Florence.

Regarding claim 16, Liu teaches a method of displaying information from a handheld electronic device on a video screen coupled to a receiver remote from the handheld electronic device, the method comprising:
generating information within the handheld electronic device wherein the generated information is adapted for display on a local display of the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 23-26); and

transmitting the generated information from the handheld electronic device over a wireless coupling to the receiver for display on the remote video screen without user input at the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 26-31).

Liu fails to teach determining at the handheld electronic device that the receiver is within a transmission range of the handheld electronic device;
responsive to a determination that the receiver is within range automatically transmitting the generated information; and

displaying the information on the display of the handheld electronic device responsive to a determination that no receiver is within range of the handheld electronic device.

In an analogous art, Florence teaches the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol to transfer data between a handheld device and a receiver (1305-figure 13, Para 66). It is well known in the art that before any data transfer using Bluetooth wireless protocol a determination has to be made as to whether or not the devices are within range (see applicant's admitted prior art "Bluetooth technology" document by Erasala and Yen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu's method to include the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol, as taught by Florence. The motivation would have been to provide a suitable wireless communication link.

Claim 20 and 27 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 16.

Regarding claim 17, Liu and Florence teach the method according to claim 16 further comprising displaying the information on the local display of the handheld electronic device concurrently with transmitting the information from the handheld electronic device over the wireless coupling (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 19, Liu and Florence teach the method according to claim 16 wherein the information from the handheld electronic device comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of an e-mail received by the handheld electronic device, a game screen for a game being played on the handheld electronic device, an

interned page received by the handheld electronic device, a photograph, and a video clip (see Liu Para. 10, lines 45-53).

Regarding claim 21, Liu and Florence teach the method according to claim 16 wherein the handheld electronic device comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a radiotelephone and a personal digital assistant (see Liu Para. 10, lines 39-43, figs. 2B and 2C).

Regarding claim 22, Liu and Florence teach the method according to claim 16 wherein the video screen comprises a television (see Liu Para. 12, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 23, Liu and Florence teach the method according to claim 16 wherein the display of the handheld electronic device is small relative to the video screen (see Liu Para.10, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 24, Liu teaches a handheld electronic device comprising:
a local display mounted on a housing of the display (Figs. 2B and 2C);
a processor coupled to the display wherein the processor is configured to generate information within the handheld electronic device wherein the information is adapted for display on the local display of the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 23-26);
a transceiver coupled to the processor wherein the transceiver is configured to transmit the generated information from the handheld electronic device over a wireless coupling

(Para. 10, lines 17-19) to a remote receiver for display on a video screen remote from the handheld electronic device (Para. 10, lines 26-31); and to display the information on the local display responsive to a determination that a receiver of a video screen is not within transmission range (Col. 10, lines 23-26).

Liu fails to teach wherein the processor is further configured to determine whether the remote receiver of the video screen is within a transmission range of the handheld electronic device, to automatically initiate transmitting the generated information from the transceiver over the wireless coupling to a receiver for display on the remote video screen without user input at the handheld electronic device responsive to a determination that a receiver of a video screen is within transmission range.

In an analogous art, Florence teaches the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol to transfer data between a handheld device and a receiver (1305-figure 13, Para 66). It is well known in the art that before any data transfer using Bluetooth wireless protocol a determination has to be made as to whether or not the devices are within range (see applicant's admitted prior art "Bluetooth technology" document by Erasala and Yen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu's method to include the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol, as taught by Florence. The motivation would have been to provide a suitable wireless communication link.

Regarding claim 25, Liu and Florence teach the handheld electronic device of claim 24 wherein the information is shown on the local display of the handheld

electronic device concurrently with transmitting the information from the handheld electronic device over the wireless coupling (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 26, Liu and Florence teach the handheld electronic device according to claim 24 wherein the processor displays the information on the local display of the handheld electronic device when no receiver is within range of the handheld electronic device (see Liu Para. 10, lines 7-8, Fig. 2B).

Regarding claim 28, Liu and Florence teach the handheld electronic device according to claim 24 wherein the handheld electronic device comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a radiotelephone and a personal digital assistant (see Liu Para. 10, lines 39-43, figs. 2B and 2C).

Regarding claim 29, Liu and Florence teach the handheld electronic device according to claim 24 wherein the local display of the handheld electronic device is small relative to the video screen (see Liu Para.10, lines 23-26).

9. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Florence in view of Motoyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Magnuson et al., US 6,504,480.

Regarding claim 38, Liu, Florence, and Motoyama disclose the method according to Claim 1.

Liu, Florence, and Motoyama fail to teach generating a beacon allowing the handheld electronic device to determine if it is within range.

In an analogous art, Magnuson teaches the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range (Col. 4, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Liu, Florence, and Motoyama to include the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range, as taught by Magnuson. The motivation would have been to provide an alternative to determine if the device is within range.

10. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Motoyama as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Magnuson.

Regarding claim 41, Liu and Motoyama disclose the video signal generator according to Claim 11.

Liu and Motoyama fail to teach a transceiver configured to provide a beacon allowing the handheld electronic device to determine if it is within range.

In an analogous art, Magnuson teaches the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range (Col. 4, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Liu and Motoyama to include the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range, as taught by Magnuson. The motivation would have been to provide an alternative to determine if the device is within range.

11. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Motoyama as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Florence.

Regarding claim 42, Liu and Motoyama disclose the video signal generator according to Claim 11. Motoyama further teaches providing an alternate video signal to the video screen (Col. 3, lines 55-63).

Liu and Motoyama fail to teach the processor is configured to determine if information is being received from the handheld electronic device, wherein the video output is configured to automatically provide the video signal to the video screen for display on the video screen responsive to determining that information is being received from the handheld electronic device.

In an analogous art, Florence teaches the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol to transfer data between a handheld device and a receiver (1305-figure 13, Para 66). It is well known in the art that before any data transfer using Bluetooth wireless protocol a determination has to be made as to who is trying to send the data in order to accept the data and this connection can be done automatically (see applicant's admitted prior art "Bluetooth technology" document by Erasala and Yen).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Liu and Motoyama's method to include the use of Bluetooth wireless protocol, as taught by Florence. The motivation would have been to provide a suitable wireless communication link.

Art Unit: 2623

12. Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Florence as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Magnuson.

Regarding claim 43, Liu and Florence disclose the method according to Claim 16.

Liu and Florence fail to teach the use of a beacon to determine if a device is within range.

In an analogous art, Magnuson teaches the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range (Col. 4, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Liu and Florence to include the use of beacons to determine if a device is within range, as taught by Magnuson. The motivation would have been to provide an alternative to determine if the device is within range.

Claim 46 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 43.

Regarding claim 44, Liu, Florence and Magnuson disclose the method according to Claim 43 wherein transmitting the generated information comprises automatically transmitting the generated information from the handheld electronic device over the wireless coupling to the receiver responsive to a determination that the receiver is within range and automatically blocking transmission of the generated information from the handheld electronic device over the wireless coupling to the receiver responsive to a determination that no receiver is within range of the handheld electronic device (see

Florence 1305-figure 13, Para 66). It is well known in the art that before any data transfer using Bluetooth wireless protocol a determination has to be made as to who is trying to send the data in order to accept the data and this connection can be done automatically also if no receiver is within range no connection can be established (see applicant's admitted prior art "Bluetooth technology" document by Erasala and Yen).

Claim 47 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 44.

Regarding claim 45, Liu, Florence, and Magnuson disclose the method according to Claim 43 displaying concurrently with transmitting the information from the handheld electronic device over the wireless coupling (see Liu Para. 10, lines 23-26).

Claim 48 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 45.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2623

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OSCHTA MONTOYA whose telephone number is (571)270-1192. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday/Friday 7:30 to 5:00 off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OM

**/Christopher Grant/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623**